

## **REMARKS**

The aforementioned Office Action rejected claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 10-13, 19, 20, 26, 29 and 42, objected to claims 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 14-18, 21-25, 27 and 28 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but allowable if rewritten in independent form, and allowed claims 30-41 and 42-61. While applicants do not agree with the rejections of claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 10-13, 19, 20, 26, 29 and 42, and reserve the right to further prosecute these claims in divisional and/or continuation applications, the applicants desire to secure some protection for their invention as early as possible. Accordingly, the present amendment cancels the rejected claims 1, 7, 12, 19, 20, 26 and 42, and rewrites claims 2, 3, 8, 9, 14, 15, 21, 22 and 27 in independent form. Claims 4-6 have been amended to depend from claim 3 rather than claim 1, and claims 10 and 11 have been amended to depend from claim 9 rather than claim 7. Claim 13 has been amended to depend from claim 15 and claims 23 and 24 have been amended to depend from claim 15 rather than claim 14; the Examiner is respectfully asked to note that there was a clerical error in original claim 13, which was intended to depend from claim 12 rather than claim 1, so that following the rewriting of claim 15 into independent form, it is appropriate to have claim 13 depend from claim 15. Claim 18 has been amended to depend from claim 15 rather than claim 12, and claim 25 from claim 22 instead of claim 19. Finally, claim 29 has been amended to depend from claim 27 instead of claim 26. Accordingly, all remaining claims up to claim 61 are allowable for the reasons stated in the Office Action.

Claims 62-86 have been added to give applicants the full scope of protection to which they believe they are entitled. Claims 62-64 parallel claim 4-6 but depend from claim 2 rather than claim 3. Similarly, claims 65 and 66 parallel claims 10 and 11 but depend from claim 8 rather than claim 9.

Claims 67 and 68 are directed to methods according to claim 14 in which the display is, respectively, an electrophoretic display and an encapsulated electrophoretic display; these claims are based, *inter alia*, on Paragraphs [0014] and [0015] respectively of the specification. Claim 69 is directed to a method according to claim 14 in which the

electro-optic medium is of the microcell type defined in Paragraph [0018] of the specification. Similarly, claim 70 is directed to a method according to claim 14 in which the display is of the passive matrix type mentioned in Paragraph [0243] of the specification.

Claims 71-74, claims 75-78, claims 79-82 and claims 83-86 are all exactly parallel to claims 67-70 except that they depend from, respectively, claims 15, 30, 43 and 57 rather than claim 14, and accordingly it is believed that the bases for claims 71-86 will readily be apparent from the discussion of claims 71-74 above.

Reconsideration and allowance of all claims remaining in this application is respectfully requested.

It is respectfully suggested that, should the Examiner allow all claims now present in this application, the ease of comprehension of the resulting patent would be improved by rearranging the claims so that the dependent claims follow immediately after the claims from which they depend, and thus in the following order:

2, 62-64  
3-6  
8, 65-66  
9-11  
14, 67-70  
15-18, 13, 71-74  
21  
22-25  
27-29  
30-41, 75-78  
43-44, 79-82  
45-56  
57-61, 83-86.

*Amundson et al.*  
*Serial No. 10/814,205*  
*Amendment of January 5, 2006*  
*Page 20*

A Fee Determination Record (Form PTO/SB/06) calculating the additional claim fees due as a result of this Amendment and a Fee Transmittal (Form PTO/SB/17) authorizing charging of these additional claim fees to the assignee's Deposit Account, are enclosed.

Since the normal period for responding to the Office Action expired November 22, 2005, a Petition for a two-month extension of this period is filed herewith.

The Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to the fact that, on May 11, 2005, the undersigned attorney filed an Information Disclosure Statement in connection with this application; a reply postcard was received confirming that the Information Disclosure Statement was received by the Office on May 13. Also, on May 12, 2005, the undersigned attorney filed by facsimile a Preliminary Amendment. The Office Action does not mention the filing of these documents. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner provide the usual initialed copies of Form PTO/SB/08 filed with the Information Disclosure Statement, and enter the Preliminary Amendment.

Respectfully submitted



David J. Cole  
Registration No. 29629

E INK Corporation  
733 Concord Avenue  
Cambridge MA 02138-1002

Telephone (617) 499-6069  
Fax (617) 499-6200  
E-mail dcole@eink.com